

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Michael E. Wolfe,)	
)	C/A No. 4:18-1350-TMC
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Nfn. Rynolds, et.al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Michael E. Wolfe, proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1).¹ On May 13, 2019, Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 267) be denied. (ECF No. 297).² Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 297-1). However, Plaintiff did not filed any objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

¹This case was reassigned to the undersigned on March 7, 2019. (ECF No. 201).

²In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., all pre-trial proceedings were referred to a magistrate judge.

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party’s waiver of the right to appeal the district court’s judgment based upon that recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 297) and incorporates it herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motions for Preliminary Injunction (ECF No. 267) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina
June 7, 2019

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 \ of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.